

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 3, and 9 have been cancelled without prejudice to filing in a later application. Claims 4-8, and 10-20 have been amended. Upon entry of the above amendments and following remarks, claims 4-8, and 10-20 will be pending in the present application.

Allowable Claims 4-8, and 10-11, 13 and 18-20

The Examiner has stated that claims 4-8, 10-11, 13 and 18-20 “would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims”. Applicant has amended allowable claims 10-11, 13 and 18-20 to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Minor non-substantive formal amendments have also been made. As such, claims 4-8, and 10-11, 13 and 18-20 should now be allowed.

Drawing Objections

The drawings have been objected to as “failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84 (p) (5)” because they do not include reference numbers associated with the lead lines. The Examiner has required that “corrected drawing sheets, in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121 (d)” be included with a response to Office Action to avoid abandonment of the application. Applicant has enclosed replacement sheets 1-4 containing Figures 1-8 in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121 (d). As such, any proper objections to the drawings have been overcome.

In addition, the Examiner objected to the drawings have been rejected under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) as failing to “show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In particular, “the base comprises an annular channel within which the terminals are located within a narrowed part of the channel”. Applicant notes that the features pointed out by the Examiner are shown in the figures. For example, Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner’s attention to

Figure 1 and to the specification at page 7, lines 20- 24. "Between the two rails there is a defined and annular channel 9 having a pair of diametrically opposed narrow portions 8. At the bottom part of each narrowed portion 8 there is provided a terminal 17". As such, any proper objection to the drawings cannot be made.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 6-8, and 18-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, wherein it has been asserted that the claims are "indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention". In particular, the Examiner has stated that "[c]laims 6, 18, and 19 recite the limitation "the engagable pivot mounting features" in lines 1 and 2" which lack antecedent basis. The Applicant has amended the claims to replace "pivot mounting" with "pivot connection" as suggested by the Examiner. As such, any proper rejection of claims 6-8, and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, has been obviated.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 2, 3, 14, 15, and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,328,581 to Lee et al.

Claim 2 Cancelled

Claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice to filing in a later application. As such, any proper rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) has been obviated.

Claim 3 Cancelled

Claim 3 has been cancelled without prejudice to filing in a later application. As such, any proper rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) has been obviated.

Claims 14 and 16 Amended

Claims 14 and 16 have been amended to depend directly on allowable claims 5 and 4 respectively. As such, claims 14 and 16 are patentable for at least the reasons claims 5 and 4 are patentable. Therefore, any proper rejection of either of claims 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) has been obviated.

Claim 15 Amended

Claim 15 has been amended to depend directly on allowable claim 11. As such, claim 15 patentable for at least the reasons claim 11 is patentable. Therefore, any proper rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) has been obviated.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 9, and 12 have have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,062,884 to Messimer et al. Claim 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Lee.

Claim 1 Cancelled

Claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice to filing in a later application. As such, any proper rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been obviated.

Claim 9 Cancelled

Claim 9 has been cancelled without prejudice to filing in a later application. As such, any proper rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been obviated.

Claim 12 Amended

Claim 12 has been amended to depend directly on allowable claim 4. As such, claim 12 patentable for at least the reasons claim 4 is patentable.

Therefore, any proper rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been obviated.


Claim 17 Amended

Claim 17 has been amended to depend directly on allowable claim 10. As such, claim 17 is patentable for at least the reasons claim 10 is patentable. Therefore, any proper rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been obviated.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael Pong Kei Wong

By: 
Guy D. Yale
Registration No. 29,125
Alix, Yale & Ristas, LLP
Attorney for Applicant

Date: April 7, 2005
750 Main Street
Hartford, CT 06103-2721
(860) 527-9211
Our Ref: MCHK/148/US

G:\AYR saved docs\Filing Docs\M C H K\MCHK.148.US Response To OA of 12.8.04.doc

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheets 1-4 of drawings include Figures 1-8.

Figures 1-8, replace the original Figure 1-8. Figures 1-8 as depicted on the replacement sheets properly have lead lines and numbers. The replacement sheets 1-4 add no new matter and are fully supported by the application as filed.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets 1-4.